

**Remarks**

Claims 7-10 and 19-23 are pending in the application. Claims 7-10 are rejected. Claims 19-23 are newly added.

**Claim rejections**

**Section 102**

Claims 7-10 were rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Kelley et al. (US 6,000,033) ("Kelley"). The Applicant respectfully traverses for at least the reason that Kelley contains no disclosure as to "allowing the requester to assume the identity of said authorized machine to which the requester is coupled after verifying that said requester is authorized," as further recited in claim 7. Kelley merely relates to password mapping and substitution; there is no assumption of the identity of an authorized machine by a requester after verification that the requester is authorized.

The Examiner contends that the latter feature is disclosed in Kelley at col. 7, lines 25-40. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. There is nothing in the cited passage about assuming the identity of an authorized machine. While it is true that, as observed by the Examiner, the passage discusses how "a request is made to [a] client computer for a password and/or userid on a web browser to gain access to ... a network service," this is not equivalent to the noted feature of claim 7. The request in Kelley is directed from a network service toward the client; i.e., the requester is the network service providing the resource. By contrast, in claim 7, the requester corresponds to the client seeking access to a resource – the reverse of what is disclosed in the cited passage of Kelley.

In view of the foregoing, it is apparent that Kelley does not suggest a requester assuming the identity of an authorized machine. It therefore follows that Kelley cannot suggest "based on the requester assuming the identity of said authorized machine, allowing the requester access to the resource" as further recited in claim 7.

Accordingly, claim 7 is allowable over Kelley. Claims 8-10 are therefore likewise allowable over Kelley for at least the reason that they include the recitations of claim 7 by dependence thereon. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-10 is therefore respectfully requested.

New claims

New claims 19-23 are allowable over the art of record, none of which discloses or suggests, for example a network element comprising an authorization database containing logic for execution by a processor, the processor to determine, based on the logic, whether a user is authorized to assume the identity of the network element to gain access to a network resource that the network element is pre-authorized to access, as recited in independent claim 19, or accessing, by a user, one of a set of network resources that a network element is pre-authorized to access, based on the user's assuming the identity of the network element, as recited in independent claim 21.


Conclusion

In light of the above discussion, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in all aspects in allowable condition, and earnestly solicits favorable reconsideration and early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (202) 220-4323 to discuss any matter concerning this application. The Office is authorized to charge any fees related to this communication to Deposit Account No. 11-0600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: MAR. 17, 2006

By:   
William E. Curry  
Reg. No. 43,572

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel: (202) 220-4200  
Fax: (202) 220-4201